DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 191 349 HE 012 905

AUTHOR Scott, R. D.
TITLE Education and Public Accountability.
INSTITUTION Queensland Univ., Brisbane (Australia).
PUB DATE 8 Mar 78
NOTE 30p.: Inaugural lecture delivered at the University of Queensland (Brisbane, Australia, March 8, 1978).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Freedom; *Accountability; Articulation (Education); *College Role; Decision Making; Foreign Countries; *Government School Relationship; Higher Education; *Institutional Autonomy; *Postsecondary Education; Resource Allocation; Retrenchment; School Community Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Australia

ABSTRACT

Accountability in education in Australia is considered, including some of the causes for the present concern for accountability of tertiary institutions and strategies that might improve the situation. Different views on the role of educational institutions, ambiguities associated with the notion of public accountability, and current difficulties associated with retrenchment are addressed. Data are presented that indicate the expansion in tertiary education between 1967 and 1975. The subsequent concern for fiscal accountability when growth was not sustained is considered. Another problem associated with the era of expansion was the creation of a binary system in which universities were permitted to progress at a relatively modest growth rate while a second type of tertiary institution was created to offer more vocationally-oriented courses. Current consideration is being given to bringing a closer relationship between the two sectors to effect more efficient use of limited resources available. Four issues pertaining to accountability at the level of the individual institution concern institutional objectives regarding equitable allocation of resources, efficient decision-making processes concerning resource allocation, appropriate community involvement in relation to these allocations, and professional autonomy that is consistent with notions of public accountability. (SW)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

INAUGURAL LECTURE
DELIVERED AT THE UNIVERSITY OF
QUEENSLAND, 8 MARCH 1978

# EDUCATION AND PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R.D. Scott

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by **R.D. SCOTT**
B.A. (Hons), Dip.Pub.Admin., D.Phil.
Professor of Public Administration,
University of Queensland

UNIVERSITY OF QUEENSLAND PRESS

ED191349
HE 012 905

© University of Queensland Press, St Lucia, Queensland, 1979

This book is copyright. Apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of private study, research, criticism, or review, as permitted under the Copyright Act, no part may be reproduced by any process without written permission. Enquiries should be made to the publishers.

Typeset by Press Etching Pty Ltd, Brisbane
Printed and bound by University of Queensland Printery, St Lucia

Distributed in the United Kingdom, Europe, the Middle East, Africa, and the Caribbean by Prentice-Hall International, International Book Distributors Ltd, 66 Wood Lane End, Hemel Hempstead, Herts., England

*National Library of Australia*
*Cataloguing-in-Publication data*

Scott, Richard Dennis
Education and public accountability

(University of Queensland inaugural lecture; no.51).
Lecture delivered 8th March, 1979.
ISBN 0 7022 1385 3

1. Educational accountability. 2. Education and state.
3. Education – Aims and objections. I. Title (Series)

379.15

When I chose the title of this lecture some months ago, it was not my intention to become embroiled in hot political controversy. Nor was it my intention to undertake a hatchet job on the basic principles of university autonomy as might be assumed from the headline in *University News*.[1] Rather I wanted to bring to bear some of the recent studies in the general field of Public Administration upon the more tepid controversy about the efficiency and effectiveness of the tertiary sector of education. However, let me assure you that I will digress into matters of current interest which bear upon the broader topic of accountability in education. I will do this because I believe that the invasion of politicians into the specific domain of curriculum design and content at the primary and secondary level may hold out threats for future developments at the tertiary level. If universities do not enjoy public confidence about the way they conduct their business, then they will be vulnerable to interference in their affairs which goes beyond ensuring that resources are being efficiently utilized. Public policy on education must be viewed as an integrated whole, so that changes in any part of the system must be recognized as having important repercussions throughout the whole system.

Before turning to the term "accountability" and its various dimensions in relation to the tertiary sector, a comment is needed on the term "education". It is disagreements about the meaning of this term which are at the heart of many of the current controversies. In some Platonic Golden Age, when there was consensus and absolute certainty about the values implicit in social organizations and the distribution of political power, education could be taken to mean the communication of the necessary skills and attitudes

which equipped the citizen to fit into the pre-existing, stable order. It is this sort of view which characterizes those who seek to restrict the role of teachers at every level of the educational process to value-free transmission of established attitudes, attitudes which are claimed to be espoused by the majority of parents and by the political leaders who represent those parents. It is this sort of view which emphasizes the virtues of vocational training at tertiary level, the instrumental as opposed to the educative value of research and the limited utility of any study in the social sciences. It is vitally important for anyone committed to alternative views to recognize that these attitudes exist in the community, that the community will not change these attitudes merely because some academics cast doubt on their validity and, most importantly, to recognize that the community has a legitimate interest in the way the whole education system functions.

The alternative view of education, to which many of us in universities and CAE's would subscribe, is that (in Dahrendorf's phrase), "The central task of education is not simply to produce spare parts for the economic process but to develop human abilities by opening them up to varied choices rather than streamlining them towards alleged requirements". [2] Partridge places the same emphasis on flexibility: "One of the main functions of higher education is to provide students with resources they need in order to explore the complexity of problems, or to grasp the complexity of frequently conflicting values that are often embedded within moral and social predicaments". [3] Where Partridge was describing the role of tertiary institutions, advocates of MACOS and SEMP would extend the argument to encompass education at senior primary and secondary level. [4] Their opponents would respond by the claim that the posing of such sophisticated value choices is inappropriate for sub-tertiary students, that society has traditionally left such value-laden issues to parents and that frequently there is a hidden curriculum which allows the offering of choices to degenerate into the advocacy by the teachers of an ideology contrary to that of the parents. There is probably more truth in some of these accusations with respect to MACOS than to SEMP, (but I would be guessing here since there has been so little public access to the SEMP materials apart from the dishonestly unrepresentative excerpt provided to Cabinet). However, the crucial question arises from the manner in which these disputes have been resolved.

There are two causes for concern about this decision. The first relates to the nature of the decision-making process in Queensland. A simplistic view of democracy might accept that the premier enjoys the confidence of cabinet, parliament and the electorate and is thus able to act on behalf of the people in any way he judges appropriate. But this ignores the reality that the bulk of decisions on public policy are based upon experts assembling evidence within the bureaucracy and briefing their individual ministers, who then seek cabinet approval where major issues of principle require the assumption of collective responsibility. The premier's intervention can only be justified if curriculum design is now to be elevated to the level of a major element in the coalition government's political platform.

If this is the case, then the second cause for concern is related to the government's view of the education process. The premier is on record as stating that "someone in the Education Department does not seem to know what the government wants children to be taught". What concerns many educationists is that highly conservative views may be foisted on a bureaucracy and a teaching profession which might otherwise reject them, so that education becomes concerned less with encouraging children to think for themselves and more with reinforcing the existing patterns of authority and prevailing social attitudes.

The premier appears to assume that there is a single set of attitudes accepted by the total community, which cuts across the Education Department's own public commitment to a plurality of viewpoints and their encouragement of the widest possible participation by the community in decisions on curriculum. To judge from the correspondence pages of the local paper, it seems that Queenslanders fear that Mrs Joyner's able campaign has won the day so that many of the items on her publicly-declared agenda will be "dealt with" — including other social science subjects in the schools, sex education and a list of 200 books in English courses which contain unsavoury material. As one correspondent put it, "Yet again the spirit of the Dark Ages casts its shadow over Queensland".[5] Writing of his own system, the Director-General of Education for New Zealand has described the new environment of accountability in education in terms which seem particularly apposite to Queensland: "The work of the schools and of the teaching profession is no longer something that the rest of society takes for granted. Where parents of earlier generations were supposed to accept on trust what the

school system was doing for their children, now they may be full of questions, or out of sympathy with it, or actively campaigning for something more to their liking. And what may be more to the liking of one group within a school community may well be anathema to some other dissatisfied group. In other words, criticism, where it exists, is likely to be ideological, stemming from value allegiances at variance with those to which the school or the education system is committed or thought to be committed.

Where our education systems used to exemplify the orthodoxy of our society's best opinion of itself, they are now becoming a battleground where organized groups strive to enshrine their own views and doctrines or to root out views and doctrines they find offensive. Where uniformity was once valued, diversity has become an inescapable fact of life. Where authority was taken for granted, it must now earn its keep. For the more that the ends of education become ideological the less can the teacher as professional claim the right to the last word on what he should be teaching. And the more that the ends of education become ideological the more are schools in danger of becoming an instrument of group assertiveness, partial views, and propaganda. If, then, we take cultural pluralism seriously, life for the professionals who serve governments as educational administrators, and for the professionals who provide educational services, can never be the same again".[6]

This ought not to be a source of regret, since the encouragement of pluralism ought to lie at the heart of liberal values in education. This encouragement needs to take the form of respecting the views of the diverse groups of parents who constitute the total community and getting away from the attitude of antagonism towards parents so often displayed by teachers. As the Musgrove and Taylor study of English schools showed, "the area of discrepancy between teachers' aims and what they imagine to be the aims of parents is still very large. On the whole, teachers take an unflattering view of parents while their own aims are remarkably idealistic, seeing parents as indifferent to moral training but much concerned with social advancement. In fact, parents are substantially in agreement with teachers. The area of unnecessary tension might be considerably reduced if parents and teachers established more effective communication".[7] But, as I have written elsewhere with respect to Canberra,[8] teachers organizations are deeply suspicious of innovations where parent participation might threaten their autonomy, and

prefer the cosiness of bureaucracy. In Queensland, however, it seems that the bureaucrats are not able to educate their political masters with their usual facility.

We must not lament the fact that education has become politicised, but rather learn to live with it. While we may have distaste for the values upheld by some political leaders in the community, it is ostrich-like and immoral to hope that such values will go away of their own accord. It is important to appreciate that democratic government rests on the acceptance of decisions by these leaders and the essence of our role as academics must be to seek to influence these decisions. If we do not, then the game will go by default to others, and education funds will be diverted to other areas. Three years ago, a minister in the current Queensland government and a member of the governing body of this university offered the following prediction: "None of us can ignore the plain fact that, despite all the spending of money and enlargement of higher learning opportunities, together with the abolition of university fees and the spawning of many CAE's, there is paradoxically widespread dissatisfaction with the education system... Governments are becoming unhappily aware that in this vexed field the more they do the less thanks they are apt to receive. Who knows: In these circumstances politicians might decide to spend the money where there is a more predictable favourable reaction". [9] Moving the focus from the school system to tertiary education, it is clear that similar problems need to be faced — how to ensure that politicians continue to spend appropriate amounts of money on us rather than on some other scheme designed to attract votes to themselves at the next election. If this puts the issue crudely, one must remember that democratic politics is a crude business. This raises the need to examine the general nature of public accountability and its particular relevance to education.

Max Beloff has written of the possible incompatability between community needs and the true function of a university and the problems of accountability when a community holds values antipathetic to the university spirit of free enquiry. [10] The same points have been made by leading Australian academics over a long period — and notably by Dr H.C. Coombs at a university conference back in 1961, when he cautioned against producing a system of education which was going to reinforce the conformist tendencies already present in Australian society. [11] However, in the same address,

Coombs also noted that it was important that the universities should be identified and should be felt to be identified with the community as a whole. In more recent years, this pressure from the community, its political leaders and its publicists has taken the form of demands for accountability for the very significant sums of public money expended on the tertiary education sector.

I would now like to exemplify some of these criticisms before discussing the wider problem of accountability, some of the causes for the present concern for accountability of tertiary institutions and finally some of the strategies which might recommend themselves to improve the present situation. There is now a vast repertoire of criticisms which can be drawn upon, but most of the themes are touched upon in television current affairs programmes such as Peter Samuels and Don Chipp on *Monday Conference* [12] and summarized in the following newspaper item:

**EDUCATION FUNDING**
**'OUT OF CONTROL'**

> The Minister for Education, Mr Jones, claimed yesterday that the funding arrangements for tertiary education had got out of control.
>
> The Free Education System introduced by the Labor Governmen. had a growth pattern in tertiary institutions that did not reflect the true needs of the community. The system had encouraged competition between institutions, which vied for increasing per capita grants to undertake more courses requiring more buildings to cope with the increasing number of students. "It is because of the faults and weaknesses inherent in the present funding arrangements that I have supported the Federal Government's stocktaking in the whole field of tertiary education," he said. Rationalization must relate to the needs of the community and accountability meant more than just financial responsibility. It also meant accountability to society — to provide not only what potential students thought they needed but to offer courses that society needed. Institutions must relate more directly to community needs than they had in the past. They did not have the sole right to determine their own destiny under the current funding arrangements.[13] (*West Australian* 13 October, 1977).

It is important not to allow this chorus of criticism to get out of perspective. Lecturing in this university, Professor Medley has made the point that "A university is a magnificent target for criticism. It is so large, it touches the community at so many points, it is inhabited by so great a variety of persons not all of whom are

equally mature, reticent or tolerant that some portion of any handful of mud thrown at it at any time will stick. Over the last few years we have been under constant fire from many quarters and, although many of the brands which have been launched at us derive from inaccurate and irresponsible hands, we have been hit sufficiently often in tender places to make curative measures desirable". [14] This was written thirty-three years ago.

Before looking at particular curative methods, it is important to explore some of the ambiguities associated with the notion of public accountability. Accountability can mean no more than merely going through the formality of reporting progress to a body which gives legitimacy to actions already taken but lacks sanctions to affect those actions — this is the sort of criticism sometimes levelled at the institution of parliament. But there are three levels or kinds of accountability: Fiscal Accountability, which is concerned with whether the funds were expended as stated in the preliminary budget; Programme Accountability, which has to do with the quality of the work carried out and whether or not it has the goals set in advance of the activity; and Process Accountability, relating to the procedures adopted, the time and effort spent on the activity. [15] In applying this typology to activities in academic institutions, as some authors have done, it becomes clear that the idea of programme accountability is the most difficult to put into practice because of the difficulty of stating objectives in such a way that they can be measured with any degree of accuracy and comparability. As a result, there is a tendency to retreat to process accountability as the only support to the blunter measurement of fiscal accountability.

Recent writing on administration, both here and overseas, has shifted the emphasis firmly towards more refined measures of performance and towards operational statements of organizational objectives. The Coombs Commission's voluminous report has this emphasis: "The Commission considers that efficiency is likely to be promoted if the objectives to which work is to be directed and the priorities attached to them are clearly stated . . . And performance at all levels is regularly assessed and those responsible held accountable for it in ways which ensure that the assessment bears upon their rewards, standing and future". [16] Coombs also seeks to introduce a body with a concern for audits of efficiency (rather than mere fiscal precision) and another key institution to undertake the coordinating of long-term resource allocation across the system as a whole. Both

these sorts of activity are notably lacking in the tertiary education sector, although doubtless the Williams Committee will be assessing the relevance of Coombs to their own deliberations.

Coombs has much to say about the efficient utilization of personnel resources which might bear upon tertiary institutions. The report notes the difficulties which flow from the security of tenure and hierarchical arrangements of the Commonwealth Public Service, especially the tendency for "deadwood" of unproductive officers to block advancement opportunities for others. It also notes the weakness in practice of attempts to screen new recruits to eliminate erroneous choices before they acquire unchallengeable rights to their position. I would not be so bold as to advocate that Coombs's prescription for the Commonwealth Public Service might also meet some of the internal management problems of tertiary institutions but there are recurrent echoes in the diagnoses offered by the Burnett Report on research and postgraduate study in this university. [17] Both documents seem to suffer from the same problem — a lack of clarity about the ultimate aims and objectives of the institutions with which they are concerned.

Betraying its multiple authorship, the Coombs Report never quite decides whether it is most concerned with restoring power to the politicians, enhancing the power of permanent heads, broadening it among the ranks of the public service or sharing it with the community. In the case of the Burnett Report, the firm emphasis on research as the predominant and distinctive characteristic of universities seem to fly in the face of the community's expectations about the teaching function of all institutions of tertiary education, a point to which I will return.

Robinson's study of management in universities in the United States and their accountability patterns showed clearly that the appeal to autonomy and a higher form of "social accountability" peculiar to academic institutions tended to serve as a cloak for self-interest because of the impossibility of establishing the group or institution to which universities ought to feel accountable. [18] Ultimately the peer group were seen to be the only arbiters of social accountability and external funding agencies were less than enthusiastic about accepting the competence of management which sought this form of independence from "normal" controls. There is, however, a long-established tradition of peer-group evaluation in the British university and polytechnic scene. This relates not to

management of finances but of standards of curriculum and examinations. This will be discussed at a later stage. The key problem remains one of measurement in terms of allocation of resources which cannot easily be met without recourse to much more stringent sets of controls on processes — measuring teaching hours, plant usage, number of students taught — to serve as performance indicators. In addition to questions of internal administration, there is the equally pressing problem of external coordination. Robinson's study of university/government relations in the USA clearly indicates that one of the major inhibitions to efficient use of resources and an adequate system of accountability related to the lack of coordination between the various levels and separate institutions engaged in any one project. The same is clearly true of the Australian tertiary sector and the broad problem of ensuring efficiency across the total system.

The striking collection of statistics shown in Figures 1, 2 and 3 point to a period of rapid expansion, both in terms of absolute student numbers and in the number of institutions. This will be followed by a sudden levelling-off, partly in response to demographic changes and partly in response to political decisions to relocate resources elsewhere. Selby-Smith and Harman pointed three years ago to the likelihood of this problem becoming a central issue but little notice was taken then. [19] They showed that, on the basis of the most reasonable alternatives offered in the Borrie Report, enrolment in universities and CAE's together will rise by no more than 90 000 over the next twenty-five years. This implies an average increase of less than a thousand students per tertiary institution in existence in 1972. If account is taken of the new institutions which have opened since 1972 then there will be less than five hundred additional students per tertiary institution over the next 25 years, i.e. an increase of only about 20 students per year per institution. [20]

This has dramatic implications for the institutions whose practices have been based on assumptions of growth and leads in particular to severe problems in staffing when student preferences inevitably shift between various disciplines and professional areas. It is a devastating indictment of the incrementalist attitudes of our education planners and decision makers that there have been such chaotic and piecemeal responses to this fluctuation in demand. It is inconceivable, for example, that those who decided only four or five

**Figure 1. Enrolments in Universities and CAES**

| Year | Number |
|---|---|
| 1921 | 8,000 |
| 1933 | 10,000 |
| 1947 | 18,000 |
| 1961 | 60,000 |
| 1967 | 126,000 |
| 1974 | 249,000 |
| 1977 | 285,000 |

**Figure 2. Growth in the CAE Sector**

| Year | Number Of Institutions | Number Of Students | % Compared To University Student Numbers |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1967 | 37 | 32,000 | 34 |
| 1972 | 44 | 53,000 | 42 |
| 1974 | 77 | 107,000 | 75 |
| 1977 | 80 | 135,000 | 88 |

**Figure 3. Levels of Participation**

| % of 17–22 AGE Group |
|---|
| 1.4 |
| 1.3 |
| 2.5 |
| 6.1 |
| 12.5 |
| 18.2 |
| 20.8 |

years ago to extend full tertiary status to seventy CAE's could have known that the services of a significant proportion of these would not be needed in the next decade. And yet the demographic data was known, even if the political attitudes towards the recurrent cost of such an expansion could only be guessed at. But this lack of forward planning remains a permanent feature of the education landscape — back in 1965 at an AIPS conference on tertiary education, Gordon Bryant was complaining that the Baby Boom of 1947 had caught the

primary schools unprepared in 1953, the secondary schools under-equipped in 1959 and the universities hopelessly understaffed in 1965.[21]

The same unwillingness to face the facts can be seen in the responses to the Borrie Report on the recent decline in population[22] — it is almost as if educational administrators do not wish to face the bad news, hoping that the very fact of institutions being in existence will pose such difficulties for any cutting-back that none will be attempted. This present crisis is, of course, more serious than the first because of the practical difficulties associated with retrenchment compared to expansion, but it is important to examine first the problems associated with the expansion era between 1967 and 1975.

The basic problem arose from the political leadership deciding to respond to increased demand by a rapid increase in the number of tertiary places available. In retrospect, it seems the stimulus here came from a federal government in which successive prime ministers calculated that increased spending on education was the most beneficial way of using the surplus of commonwealth funds in an era of prosperity and inflated taxation incomes. The trend accelerated under Whitlam but the pattern of intervention was well established under Holt and Gorton, as can be seen from the statistics developed and analysed by Birch and Smart.[23] (see Figure 4). This had the effect of detaching the sense of fiscal accountability from state governments which retained the constitutional responsibility and practical control over the provision of higher education. When somebody else was picking up the tab, what state leader would reject the apparently prestigious gift of new tertiary institutions? Mr Fraser is obviously intent on making a few chickens come home to roost, especially in Victoria, where one of the legacies of the Bolte premiership seems to be a CAE on everyone's front doorstep.

**Figure 4. Commonwealth Spending on Education**

| | $000,000 |
|---|---|
| 1964-65 | 106.4 |
| 1968-69 | 192.6 |
| 1971-72 | 354.4 |
| 1972-73 | 442.6 |
| 1973-74 | 860.1 |
| 1974-75 | 1671.6 |
| 1975-76 | 1908.2 |

In an important speech at ANZAAS, the Tasmanian Minister of Education indicated the problems that this is likely to create for the states: "Under the name of the New Federalism the conservative forces have conceived a method of bringing about a fundamental change of direction in education spending with the prospects of minimal political reaction. . . . The recent proposal to transfer to the states part of the responsibility for funding universities and colleges is in line with the general philosophy of antagonism to public expenditure. If this occurred, the states, with limited funds, would be forced to restrict funding of colleges and universities and the Commonwealth, without that limitation, would be able to argue publicity for increased allocations, knowing that the states would be unable to respond to this conditional request. . . . The states would thus bear the odium of increased taxes and abandoned programmes . . New Federalism is therefore a recipe for a gradual wasting of the national commitment to education, and a change in the historical pattern of increasing public commitment with minimal pain by way of public antagonism".[24]

This touches on the second major problem associated with the era of expansion — the creation of a dual system in which universities were permitted to progress at a relatively modest growth-rate while a second type of tertiary institution was created to offer more vocationally-oriented courses. These new colleges of advanced education were intended to be different from but equal to universities, especially in the crucial question of staffing conditions. There seems to have been an assumption that they would be cheaper to operate than universities because they would not make such heavy demands for research staff and equipment. State governments also quickly established that they could get CAE's established on the cheap by upgrading a range of existing institutions, hoping thus to save on capital costs. It is doubtful whether much was saved in this way but it meant that the number of tertiary institutions expanded dramatically, even though many of them are of uneconomically small size.[25] (see Figure 5).

But size was less a factor in dispute than the role which was seen to differentiate CAE's from universities. In a famous speech while Minister of Education, Mr Fraser articulated a description of the two types of students suited to universities and CAE's, which amounted to a distinction between "thinkers" and "doers".[26] Several commissions, academic leaders and university staff associations

**Figure 5. Size of CAE's**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1974 | Average No. of students per CAE | = | 1392 | |
| | Average No. of students per university | = | 8929 | |
| | | | | % of Total Number (N = 77) |
| 11 | CAE's | < | 200 students | 14 |
| 22 | CAE's | < | 500 students | 28.5 |
| 44 | CAE's | < | 1000 students | 57 |
| 64 | CAE's | < | 2000 students | 83 |

have also addressed themselves to this key definitional question. Vocationalism — fitting students for particular tasks — is seen to be at the heart of most of the comments. But it is complete nonsense to assume that some general principle can be applied in this way, and then made to stick as a firm barrier between the activities of otherwise competitive academic institutions of notional equality. The natural competition will overwhelm the guidelines, as it has done in every state, and will continue to do so, to whatever extent institutions are given autonomy to plan their own activities.

This is particularly so, when the basis of differentiation is as futile as "vocationalism". Many students are at university to be trained for a vocation — lawyers, vets, school teachers, engineers, architects, social workers, journalists, doctors and dentists — and it has usually been the choice of the university to offer them a liberal education as well, in varying proportions according to faculty. As a community service, the university also allows those responsible for the liberal education elements in vocational "training" to also dole out bigger helpings of liberal education to groups who either are still uncertain about future employment, are already in employment or are seeking a leisure activity in retirement. In the CAE's, the balance is not very different, even if the particular vocational courses are different. In both places, one gets the impressions that shortage of numbers of school-leavers has suddenly opened the eyes of educators and administrators to the much wider potential market of "mature age entrants". They have been there all the time, of course, but one suspects that the universally popular ideology of recurrent education is at bottom a pragmatic response by educationists to ensure that they stay in work.

The major difference between CAE's and universities is essentially an historical one — certain courses were absorbed into universities over the generations and have been regarded as legitimate university activities because they demand a high degree of intellectual effort. Other courses of study have emerged later and many have not found their way into all universities, even where similar levels of intellectual effort may be required. It is important to note that there was nothing inevitable about the decision to hive off certain activities into a separate "vocational" stream of tertiary institutions during the 1960's. At a conference at the beginning of the decade in which Karmel, Partridge and others were advocating a binary strategy which would leave universities free to continue much as before, one voice stood out against the trend: In terms which might find more sympathy now than then, a research officer from the University of New South Wales asserted that "With respect to the increase in the number of professional courses mainly bound up with specialized technologies, I can accept that this raises problems but I reject wholeheartedly the solution of establishing colleges of advanced technology. Contrary to general beliefs, this is not a new problem, and when universities have been at their strongest and most healthy they have been most in tune with the professional requirements of their day, and Law and Medicine, Science and Engineering have in turn found their place in the universities by probably having to battle, each in turn, against opposing interests". [27] In the important case of teacher education, the distinction between vocational and liberal education is reflected in the derogatory implications attached to the notion of "training". While universities encouraged that breadth of scholarship which allowed its graduates to cope with the unknown, training colleges equipped their students to deal only with established patterns of knowledge and the technical skills of teaching. But if teachers are to face the challenges to their authority and the demands of cultural pluralism described earlier, then clearly their needs go beyond mere training based on universally accepted truths and come to resemble precisely the needs met by universities — learning to cope with the unknown.

The exact mix of university/CAE responsibilities for courses is a product more of the relative strength of the competing institutions in gaining political support than adherence to any single principle of differentiation. In the era of expansion, the justification for the

variety of institutions which were allowed to lay claim to full tertiary status was accordingly not capable of being restricted on any basis of rational planning. Neither the Universities Commission nor the Commission on Advanced Education felt capable of undertaking the difficult (but not impossible) task of forward manpower planning and as a result the natural impulse to organizational imperialism was allowed to run riot. In this regard, I can draw upon my experience of the Canberra CAE, which operates under the direction of one of the most able imperialists ever to come out of darkest Africa. My teaching there was grounded in the same liberal assumptions as I applied before and I apply now in universities; it would have been insulting to my students to have done otherwise. Public administration may have been their profession and my subject but the educational aims were identical with those I pursued in classes on political analysis in Northern Ireland or labour relations in Uganda.

The decision that the Canberra CAE move to a course in social sciences was not taken in the face of restrictions about the need for vocationalism but through a process of redefining this term towards a more liberal meaning. [28] And that institution now offers a Master's degree in Administration which is altogether more theoretical and research-oriented than that with which it competes at the ANU. This was because the ANU were first into the field and staked out the coursework/pragmatic/quantitative territory in advance. This is an amicable and sensible arrangement, welcomed on both campuses, but it makes a joke of attempts to distinguish between the aims and objectives of the two institutions on grounds of vocationalism. The hang-over from this age of affluence is now clear to behold — a large number of unnecessary institutions, especially in the field of teacher education most susceptible to downturns in school populations; a sense of anxiety among the staff who moved into CAE's from the university system and are now immobilized in senior posts there; a loss of flexibility in resource allocation in the whole tertiary sector because so much is irrevocably committed to recurrent salary costs without any certainty that the staff employed are still appropriate to the changing pattern of demand in education. It has been argued by Rosen [29] that the up-grading of CAE staff, too frequently without outside advertisement, means that there are people absorbed into the general tertiary sector who were more comfortably placed as employees of state education departments and have lost the security and status of that arrangement in return for a rather shabby place in the emerging hierarchy among tertiary institutions.

It is certainly true that there is an intense sense of competitiveness within and between institutions as a result of a sudden decline in the level of resources available. Funding by student numbers means that every teacher and administrator in every institution is seeking to maximize numbers to justify the present level of staffing and support resources or to assist in claims for a slice of whatever expansion funds are available. This has meant, at the level of the individual institution, a disturbing willingness to relax entry standards and within individual units to offer content and assessment packages more noted for their appeal to the student's natural instinct for soft option than for their intellectual rigour. This is not an attack on this university in particular, although it does echo sentiments expressed at the last meeting of the Professorial Board; it is pointing to a general fact of life in tertiary institutions across the nation.

If it is accepted that this situation flows from a lack of coordination after a period of poorly-regulated expansion, then the solution to some aspects of the problem may lie within the purview of a single national planning authority aided by stronger direction at the state level. The Tertiary Education Commission may evolve into this national regulatory role, especially after the reforms consequent on the deliberations of the present Williams Committee enquiry. At the state level, there is both a lack of homogeneity across states and a notable contrast between the autonomy of CAE's and universities within states. Precise arrangements vary from state to state, but only Western Australia seems to have an effective integration between the universities and the small CAE sector. Victoria has horrendous problems consequent on the creation of two mazes of CAE's (the Victorian Institute of Colleges and the State College of Victoria) and the addition of a fourth multi-campus university to the three Melbourne universities. New South Wales, with a tradition of more emphasis on university growth is better placed, as is Queensland.

But one hiatus still exists in the local planning process, which is a legitimate source of grievance for the CAE's in Queensland. This is that the existing state regulatory bodies — the Board of Advanced Education and the Board of Teacher Education — have only limited impact on university policies. This means that CAE's are disadvantaged by a process of course accreditation in their search for new areas of activity. It also means that any move towards rationalization of offerings between CAE's and the universities can only

proceed on terms set by the university. In an environment in which political interference is rampant, I am hesitant about suggesting a ceding of university autonomy on anything at all, let alone anything connected with curriculum. But if one regards the current controversy over social science in the schools as a failure of the bureaucratic process, then bureaucratization may have the attraction of putting up barriers to the sort of arbitrary intervention manifest across the whole range of recent decisions, not excluding the location of power stations.

For this reason, the university may look with favour on proposals to bring them into closer relationship with the CAE sector as a basis for establishing more efficient use of the limited resources available. This could embrace the sharing of staff and facilities, specialization in the collection of library materials, common access to electronic data processing and even more systematic cross-crediting of activities undertaken by students. (This last suggestion could be widened to a form of national cross-recognition of units studied, originally envisaged as one function of the now-defunct National Institute of Open Tertiary Education — NIOTE. If a system of external examiners existed to accredit the comparability of courses on a national basis, then it seems logical to allow students to take advantage of the offerings throughout the system. There are significant problems associated with such mobility at the moment — NIOTE would have eliminated the problem by accrediting approved combinations for a nationally-awarded degree like the CNAA award in Britain). [30]

The assumption behind these proposals is one of equality between participating institutions. Whatever the theory about the binary system, the fact of the matter is that there are aspirations towards equality on the part of the CAE's, which are only fulfilled occasionally in practice. There is great diversity in the CAE system and within individual CAE's, with the best being in front of some departments in some universities and the worst not commanding very much respect from academics at all. It might be appropriate for a single educational planning authority to initiate a pattern of single comprehensive institutions serving a defined region, perhaps on a multi-campus basis. What is worth keeping within the CAE's ought to be integrated into this sort of pattern and embraced within the title of a university. The choice could be most appropriately based on the academic standards of staff and the intellectual capabilities of the

change from this arrangement would be that nobody is pretending, or ought to pretend, that the TAFE colleges should be staffed, equipped or provided with academic resources on the basis of parity with universities. This was the error of the original binary system, pretending to an equality which was ultimately socially divisive. [31]

To return to the level of the individual institution, there seems to be four issues which deserve closer attention in relation to notions of accountability: first, the development of clearer statements of the objectives of the institution and the more equitable allocation of resources to meet these objectives; second, the establishment of effective and efficient decision-making processes concerning resource allocations internally; third, the appropriate level and character of community involvement in relation to these allocations; finally, the area of professional autonomy which ought to be accepted as consistent with notions of public accountability.

First, on institutional objectives, it is important to recognize that the university is not very different from any other large public service organization, with its clients, its operatives and its central management. The problem is to measure the output against some agreed set of objectives. As pointed out earlier, programme accountability is particularly difficult to achieve for an educational output. Process accountability is more feasible, relating to an accurate measure of the amount of activity which occurs in the performance of the task directed towards the institution's objectives. Here, the university staff association has reassured the Williams Committee that it is "assiduous in its own efforts to ensure that tenure is granted only to staff who meet the highest intellectual standards" [32] and that they agree with Partridge's view that universities are distinguished from CAE's because they are part of an international community and that "their standards in both teaching and research are exposed to the scrutiny and judgement of sister universities elsewhere in Australia and throughout the world". [33]
students in their courses (aided by crude measures such as Tertiary Entrance Scores).

The residue — the sort of courses which have not attracted degree-awarding status and presumably lack that content of liberal education which I personally regard as a defining characteristic of a true tertiary education — could be allocated to the TAFE sector. At an earlier stage, when commonwealth funding was made contingent on courses being offered at tertiary level (i.e. post-matriculation)

the TAFE sector inherited courses from institutions aspiring to CAE status and benefitted greatly as a result, even though some CAE's dropped below an economic size as a consequence. The major

As a matter of history, if not present intention, the Burnett Report casts doubt upon these claims in its advocacy of a transference of a significant amount of real resources from the teaching to the research function in this university. And I would offer the tentative personal observations that there are in fact few effective controls or performance indicators which ensure that staff members provide approximately equal contributions to the achievement of the university's multiple objectives. Even such a crude measure of hours spent in front of a class and the numbers of students taught overall seems to result in amazing discrepancies in terms of what economists call "unit productivity". Coombs proposed to deal with this problem in the Commonwealth Public Service by abolishing the distinction between permanent and temporary appointment and substituting a system which carried a guarantee of employment but no guarantee of a particular level of income and seniority. Posts and people could then be reclassified according to their productivity and "value" to the organization. The mechanics of introducing such a system into a university are mind-bending, but there may be less dramatic management techniques available which would ensure some process accountability with respect to the teaching activity of academics.[34] Discrepancies between status and performance in teaching would be less disturbing if it could be shown that those not engaged in teaching were advancing the general stock of universal knowledge through independent research. This remains to be proven, but what is clearly needed is a greater concern to measure overall productivity, a more searching instrument of internal management than the present cursory enquiries on class sizes and teaching commitments. There may also be a need to tighten the present techniques of fiscal accountability — as well as process accountability — concerning the disbursement of research funds. Indeed, the role of research may come to be examined more closely if forces external to the university seek to assert a greater degree of public accountability. The standard defence that research is necessary to good teaching — used in the Burnett Report and elsewhere — is not self-evident, and has been called into question by a number of authors concerned about the priority accorded research in many tertiary institutions.

In an institution such as this one, with massive first-year classes needing specialized teaching abilities and that clear grasp of the basic concepts of a discipline which only comes with maturity, I would hold to the view that research ought not to be elevated to the point where it poses a barrier to advancement for effective teachers. It would be my intuition that — in the arts and social sciences in particular — it is likely that the community would share this view about the priority of teaching above research.

In support of this intuition, it is possible to point to the prevailing attitudes overseas, especially to the United States where most trends seem to originate and flow on to Australia a decade later. Throughout the 1950's and 1960's, the effect of the big push into research activity had an effect on the major American universities in terms of their expenditure patterns and recruitment preferences. They were spurred on by the notion that the education industry was the basis for future national growth and greatness. There is now a pronounced reaction against that trend. The pressure towards research is seen to have had an adverse effect by both the community and the students. A regional accreditation agency (which, significantly enough, covers all colleges and universities in the area) recently criticized no less an institution than Harvard on the grounds that the quality of teaching was "incommensurate with the otherwise well-deserved reputation of the university". [35]

The new dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science at Harvard, Henry Rokovsky, accepted the need to revise the aspirations of the institution in this regard, because postgraduate enrolments were rapidly declining and there was increased consumer consciousness among undergraduates about the competence of teachers and the standards achieved. As a result, he is pressing departmental chairman to include formal evaluation of teaching skills in all future recommendations for tenure and has initiated the use of training sessions in pedagogical technique. [36]

This is, of course, an area where a previous vice-chancellor at Queensland devoted considerable effort and resources almost a generation ago. Back in 1960, Sir Fred Schonnell pointed to this university's achievements in the training of university teachers — addressing a conference of vice-chancellors, he recommended an early version of TEDI to the assembled luminaries, emphasizing the primacy of the teaching function and the need for a "capacity for unremitting self-criticisms of one's own teaching technique". [37] He

pointed with pride to the total enrolments for such training in that year — 128 staff members. This compares with the meagre half-dozen who enrolled for a similar course at the beginning of this year. Somewhere our priorities seem to have shifted.

Associated with the need to revitalize a commitment to teaching is the need to consider the relationship between the student and the total "learning experience" to which he is exposed. It is not enough for each of us to consider our own teaching; we need to be aware of the activities of other teachers and to measure whether the package of units undertaken by a student add up to a coherent education. In the competition for student loyalties and in deference to fashions of consultation, it seems that the notion of a structured curriculum has fallen into disrepute. Perhaps because none of us feels confident enough to assert what might constitute the core of a paticular discipline, we allow students to choose — at least in the faculties of Arts and Education — from a smorgasboard of autonomous units. This seems to be an abrogation of our professional responsibilities since these decisions are ones where students have the least possible expertise almost by the fact of their definition as students. This may be a hard question for academics but it is one increasingly being asked in both Britain and America.

David Truman, an American political scientist, has asserted that the answer to this question and questions about links between disciplines "will require from active academics a serious, continuing and explicit concern for education. One can get the impression that departmental and professional gatherings are the last places to encounter serious discussion about education. Presidents and deans are expected to pontificate on such matters, and the talk of professional educationists is tolerated if they keep to themselves, but an impression is conveyed that such concerns are not quite respectable for serious scholars". [38] In an attempt to refine and assess the objectives of the total institution, to discuss the priorities by which resources are to be allocated and the contribution to be made by the constituent parts, the Darling Downs Institute of Advanced Education recently conducted an "organizational development" exercise which eventually incorporated all levels of the institution. This was immensely time-consuming but also immensely useful in identifying problem areas where the old structure no longer fitted the demands of new objectives and where resources were being uneconomically dispersed rather than concentrated. [39]

While recognizing the impossibility of mounting (and financing) such an exercise here, it might be that greater awareness of modern managerial techniques and cost-benefit-analysis could lead to significant improvements in performance. We might need, for example, to calculate accurately the cost of large meetings such as Professorial Board and relate these costs to the significance of the decisions which they debate. This might lead to some startling results; if each hour of the Board's time is worth more then $1100, perhaps decisions on the allocation of a few hundred dollars might be entrusted to the vice-chancellor or his executive committees. Again, this is not a new problem, although the Burnett Committee feels the magnitude has increased in an age of participatory democracy.[40] Nearly twenty years ago, a professor of law from Melbourne University who later moved on to higher offices such as a university vice-chancellorship commented upon the time wasted because of confusions between the representative and deliberate functions of committees.

In order to avoid wasting scarce and precious teaching resources, he indicated a general preference for "a quite authoritarian regime".[41] One wonders incidentally whether Sir Zelman will be in a position to indulge his preference in his new job? At the same time, there needs to be an awareness of the virtues of collegiate decision-making as a basis for ensuring commitment to policies once arrived at, a point developed at some length in the Coombs Report. The key problem is to ensure that the use of committees is restricted to those issues of great moment which currently fail to attract attention amid the paraphernalia of trivia. In a truly collegiate environment, considerations of formal hierarchy should not impede delegation of "work-face" decisions to those actually doing the work, so that senior committees have the primary task of coordination and the maintenance of common standards. This leads on to a discussion of one of these issues of great moment, the community's influence over the internal management of tertiary institutions.

The literature on accountability quoted earlier notes that there is a tendency for outside forces to become concerned only when there appears to be a breakdown of internal management controls. In the case of universities, there has been no evidence of this breakdown and loss of confidence, so that there has so far been few instances of undue external pressures. This is not to say that they will not come, and a nasty precedent has been set with the attempt to exert pressure

on the director of one CAE in relation to that institution's involvement (at the behest of the state Department of Education) in training teachers to use the MACOS curriculum. A so-called Community Standards Organization threatened to instruct its members to refuse to employ graduates of the CAE until it eliminated all MACOS material from its library.

Thankfully, this is a rare occurrence to date. In general, community representatives on governing bodies have played, if anything, an overly passive role. There is a lack of certainty on their part as to their precise function; in most cases, they settle for the comfortable position of allowing themselves to be socialized into accepting the institution's view of the environment and act as the institution's spokesmen in dealings with the outside world. However, as the following comment from Walter Crocker, Lieutenant Governor of South Australia makes clear, this may not always be in the best interests of public accountability: "The difficulty of contesting unreasonable demands from certain academics has been accentuated by the attitude that such and such an issue was an 'academic' and not a 'lay' matter and must therefore be excluded even from the council. More than once I found it necessary to remind the council that it is the sovereign body in the university . . . The days when there was money to burn for education and when no one dared ask awkward questions about the cost of nurturing the sacred cow are probably over forever. Academics would certainly be ill-advised to try to twist the principle of academic freedom into an argument absolving themselves from public accountability. [42]

The difficulty lies in the academic's capacity to draw a line between that area for which the community can claim a measure of accountability and that other area which ought to be reserved to his professional judgement. The term "professional" does not come easily to academic lips, smacking as it does of the market place and the exploitation of skills on the basis of fee-for-service. But in the current age of financial stringency and scepticism about the final product of our educational activities, autonomy must rest upon the claims of all professionals to possess expert and specialized knowledge — in this case, about the nature of higher education and the best methods for its communication in relation to the purposes of the clients, the students. As Peter Blau has pointed out in his study, "The Organization of Academic Work", "Academics differ in several respects from professionals, although there are also a

number of similarities between the two. Probably the most important similarity for a study of academic institutions is the significance of professional and academic autonomy and self-regulation. Since the work of the specialized experts is too complicated to be accurately judged by laymen, fellow specialists are the only ones qualified to evaluate it. This principle has become institutionalized in professional associations that claim sole jurisdiction over licensing professionals and judging their work, and in university faculties that demand freedom from administrative interference in evaluating academic work and making faculty appointments".[43]

This principle needs to be set against the equally compelling principle of accountability embodied in the notion of bureaucracy. Indeed it is the tension between these two principles, and in particular the problem of defining their respective scope, which is at the heart of current arguments about the education system as a whole. It is not sufficient for academics to rest their claim to authoritative decision-making on the single principle of academic freedom and professional autonomy. The plain fact is that the community will not automatically accept our claim; it is traditionally suspicious of academics and becoming more so in the light of public criticisms about the way *we* spend *their* money. If we as academics believe strongly in the virtues of a liberal form of education, as defined earlier, then we must be willing to exert ourselves to convince the community and its political leaders of the correctness of our views. But to be convincing we must be seen to be running an orderly establishment which makes best use of its resources; we must be seen to be putting the emphasis on those functions for which the community sustains our existence; on an institutional as well as a departmental basis, we must collaborate as equals within the tertiary sector rather than battling among ourselves; on a personal basis, we need to be seen to give value for the educational dollar. Then, once our house is in order, we can aspire to perform those higher functions of defending those other, cultural values which we hold to be the essence of liberal education.

## NOTES TO TEXT

1. *University News* 22 February 1978 carried the headline "Academic autonomy under attack" and opened the article with the sentence that "The traditional notions of professional and academic autonomy will be called into question in an inaugural lecture to be delivered at the University of Queensland soon".
2. Ralf Dahrendorf, *The New Liberty: Survival and Justice in a Changing World*, (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975), p. 74.
3. P. Partridge, "Relevance and the Teaching of Disciplines", *Quadrant* XV, no. 6 (November - December 1971).
4. MACOS: *Man A Course of Study*, and SEMP: *Social Education Materials Project* were two sets of teaching materials banned by the intervention of the premier via cabinet. MACOS is a packaged American production involving a total curriculum design while SEMP is a more flexible collection of materials which leaves discretion to individual teachers. SEMP was produced by a series of local publishers in response to an initiative from the Curriculum Development Centre in Canberra and with the financial support and active cooperation of all state departments of education. For further details, see Ann Gowers and Roger Scott, "Politics and Education in Queensland", a paper read at the APSA conference, Adelaide in August 1978.
5. *Courier Mail*, 24 February 1978.
6. W.L. Renwick, "Leopards with Changing Spots", a paper presented to the Fourth National Conference of the Australian Council for Education Administration, Brisbane, August 1977.
7. F.W. Musgrove and P.H. Taylor, *Society and the Teacher's Role*, (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul) p.76.
8. F.G. Morgan and R.D. Scott, "Participatory Impotence — Local Community Involvement in Education", Kendall et.al., *A.C.T. Papers on Education*, CCAE, 1976.
9. C. Porter, "Advanced Education — Is It?" in L.J. Barker, ed., *Governance of the Australian Colleges of Advanced Education*, (Toowoomba: Darling Downs Institute of Advanced Education, 1975) p. 164.
10. M. Beloff, "Can the Universitites Survive?" in C.B. Cox and R. Boyson, eds., *The Fight for Education*, (London: Dent, 1975), p. 45.
11. H.C. Coombs in *Proceedings of the Conference of Australian Universities 1961*, (Sydney: University of Sydney, 1961), p. 61.
12. Peter Samuels, "Colleges and Universities", *Monday Conference*, 3 October 1977 provided a wide-ranging critique of the present tertiary system and in particular the lack of accountability for both teaching and research. At one point, a questioner argued that his schemes for reform — in particular, funding via student fees and research contracts — were unrealistic because "no politician would commit political suicide by supporting them, not even Don Chipp." Five weeks earlier on the same programme, Chipp had argued along exactly similar lines to Samuel, believing that wastage at tertiary level was depriving the government of funds needed at the pre-school level where all the social problems had their origin (*Monday Conference*, 5 September 1977).
13. *West Australian*, 13 October 1977.
14. J.D.G. Medley, *The Present and Future of Australian Universities*, (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1945), p. 10.
15. This typology is described in D.Z. Robinson, "Government Contracting for Academic Research: Accountability in the American Experience" in B.L.R. Smith and D.C. Hague, eds., *The Dilemma of Accountability in Modern Government*, (London: Macmillan, 1971).

16. *The Royal Commission on Australian Government and Administration: 1974-1976 (Chairman: Dr H.C. Coombs)*. "Summary of the Report," *Public Administration* vol. 55 (August 1977): 270.
17. *Research and Postgraduate Study in the University of Queensland*. Report of a Committee Chaired by Professor Burnett, University of Queensland, 1977.
18. See Bruce Smith, "Accountability and Independence in the Contract State", in Smith and Hague, *Dilemma of Accountability* pp. 49-52
19. C. Selby-Smith and G. Harman, "Current Trends and Issues in the Governance of the Australian Colleges of Advanced Education: Some Findings of Research" in Barker, *Governance of the Australian CAE* p. 97.
20. Ibid. p. 96.
21. G. Bryant, Discussion on S. Encel, "Politics and Resources for Tertiary Education", in J. Wilkes, ed., *Tertiary Education in Australia*, Proceedings of the Thirty-first Summer School of the Australian Institute of Political Science, (Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1965).
22. *Population and Australia: A Demographic Analysis and Projection. The First Report of the National Population Enquiry*, Chairman: W.D. Borrie (Canberra: Australian Government Printing Service, 1975).
23. Don Smart "The Accelerating Commonwealth Participation, 1964-1976", in I. Birch and D. Smart, eds., *The Commonwealth and Education, 1964-1976: Political Initiatives and Developments*, (Melbourne: Drummond, 1977) pp. 25-26.
24. N.L.C. Batt, M.L.A., "Labor's Social Policy and Objectives", ANZAAS Conference, Melbourne University, August 1977, p. 4.
25. Selby-Smith and Harman, "Current Trends and Issues", p. 97.
26. For further discussion, see M. Fraser, "Autonomy and Responsibilities", *Vestes* 12, no. 2 (June 1969)
27. L.N. Short, *Proceedings of the Conference of Australian Universities, 1961*, p. 144.
28. See R.D. Scott, "The Birth of a Social Science Degree: Reflections of a Midwife" and "Vocationalism and the Teaching of Politics" in G. Harman and R.D. Scott, eds., *Teaching Politics in Colleges of Advanced Education*, APSA/ Education Research Unit, (Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1975).
29. B. Rosen, "The Decline and Fall of Teacher Education in Australia", *Australian Journal of Advanced Education* 5 no. 2 (1975).
30. *Open Tertiary Education in Australia*, Final Report of Committee on Open University to the Universities Commission, (Canberra: AGPS, 1975). See also B. Falk and J. Anwyl, "An Open University for Australia: A Comment on the Debate", *Australian Journal of Advanced Education*, 3, no. 3 (December 1973).
31. A number of authors have cautioned about the elitism which tends to emerge in a binary system. See, for remarkably different views of the British scene, Berenice Martin, "Undermining the Ivory Tower" in C.B. Cox and R. Boyson, *Fight for Education*, and Eric Robinson, Deputy Director of North-East London Polytechnic, Keynote Address *Challenges Facing Advanced Education*, Report of the 1970 Conference of the Federation of Staff Associations of Australian Colleges of Advanced Education, (Melbourne: The Hawthorn Press, 1970). See, on Australia, C.A. Hughes, "Equality and Elitism in Tertiary Education in Australia," a paper read at an ANU seminar, 6 May 1975 to appear in a forthcoming publication. Hughes sums up by noting that, "the trouble is that, to the extent that universities have always had a clear vocational role, it is extremely difficult to separate out roles for two classes of institutions . . . It may be that, despite the Labor Government's attempts to extend equality of opportunity in tertiary education, that it will be in the type of institution attended that inequality of opportunity, elitism if you prefer, will continue to appear and perhaps even intensify."

32. Chapter Five, "Distinguishing Features of Universities", *FAUSA Submission to the Williams Committee of Enquiry*, June 1977, para.5.18, page 30.
33. *Ibid*, quoting from *Post-secondary Education in Western Australia*, January, 1975, (Partridge Report), para.8.19.
34. An interesting attempt to apply some measurement criteria is described in J. Dixon, "The Cost-effectiveness of a College of Advanced Education: Some Methodological Issues", *Australian Journal of Advanced Education*, 6, (1976); and J. Cutt, *Resource Allocation for Tertiary Education in Australia*, (Canberra: ANU Press, 1977).
35. *New York Times* 5 December 1977.
36. *Ibid.*
37. F.J. Schonnell, "The Problems in Teaching", *Proceedings of the Conference of Australian Universities, 1961*, Sydney University, 1961, p. 123. See also Australian Vice-Chancellors Committee, *Report of a Conference on University Education*, Melbourne University, 1960.
38. D. Truman, "The Social Sciences: Maturity, Relevance and the Problem of Training" in A. Ranney, ed., *Public Policy and Political Science*, Chicago: Markham, 1968), p. 288.
39. The proceedings of the review, including the extensive reports of outside consultants, will be published by the Darling Downs Institute.
40. *Research and Postgraduate Study in the University of Queensland*, p. 30.
41. Z. Cowen in *ibid*, p. 80.
42. *The Advertiser* 27 October 1977.
43. P. Blau, *The Organisation of Academic Work*, (New York: John Wiley, 1973, p. 12.